



**PARTIES**

4. The Plaintiff, Barbara Ann Schmidt Castro (“Plaintiff”), is an adult individual residing in Somerville, Massachusetts, and is a “consumer” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. Defendant Oxford Management Services (“OMS”), is a Florida business entity with an address of 4180 Okeechobee Road, Fort Pierce, Florida 34947, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by OMS and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. OMS at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

**ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS**

**A. The Debt**

8. The Plaintiff is being contacted for a financial obligation (the “Debt”) to a creditor (the “Creditor”) that does not belong to her.

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to OMS for collection, or OMS was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

**B. OMS Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics**

12. The Defendants called the Plaintiff at home regarding a debt that does not belong to her.

13. The Defendants placed telephone calls to the Plaintiff twice a day.

14. During telephone conversations, the Defendants always asked for a “Miriam Sosa”. Miriam Sosa is known to the Plaintiff.

15. The Plaintiff explained to the Defendants that she is not Miriam Sosa, and requested that the Defendants stop contacting her. The Defendants however, continued to call the Plaintiff.

16. The Defendants employed automated telephone calls to contact the Plaintiff.

17. The Defendants placed their telephone calls to the Plaintiff’s residential landline, during the day, while the Plaintiff is at her place of employment.

18. During one telephone conversation, the Defendants told the Plaintiff that they had never called her. The Defendants however, had contacted the Plaintiff every day previously to such telephone conversation.

**C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages**

19. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants’ unlawful conduct.

20. As a direct consequence of the Defendants’ acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

21. The Defendants' conduct was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.**

22. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2) in that Defendants used profane and abusive language when speaking with the consumer.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

28. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

29. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

**COUNT II**  
**VIOLATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,**  
**M.G.L. c. 93A § 2, et seq.**

30. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

31. The Defendants employed unfair or deceptive acts to collect the Debt, in violation of M.G.L. c. 93A § 2.

32. Defendant's failure to comply with these provisions constitutes an unfair or deceptive act under M.G.L. c. 93A § 9 and, as such, the Plaintiff is entitled to double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees.

**COUNT III**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT –**  
**47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.**

33. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

34. Without prior consent the Defendants made telephone calls to the Plaintiff's residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the prior express consent of the Plaintiff in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).

35. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

36. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

**COUNT IV**  
**INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION**

37. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

38. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, “One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.”

39. Massachusetts further recognizes the Plaintiff’s right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendant violated Massachusetts state law.

40. The Defendant intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff’s right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with numerous telephone calls.

41. The telephone calls made by Defendant to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, “hounding the plaintiff,” and, “a substantial burden to her existence,” thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

42. The conduct of the Defendant in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

43. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from Defendant.

44. All acts of Defendant and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendant is subject to punitive damages.

**COUNT V**  
**INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

45. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein at length.

46. The acts, practices and conduct engaged in by the Defendants vis-à-vis the Plaintiff was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

47. The foregoing conduct constitutes the tort of intentional infliction of emotional distress under the laws of the State of Massachusetts.

48. All acts of Defendants and the Collectors complained of herein were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendants are subject to imposition of punitive damages.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against Defendants;
4. Double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to M.G.L. c. 93A § 3(A);
5. Statutory damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) & (C);

6. Actual damages from Defendants for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
7. Punitive damages; and
8. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

**TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS**

Dated: June 1, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg, Esq. (BBO# 650671)  
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.  
1100 Summer Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06905  
Telephone: (203) 653-2250  
Facsimile: (877) 795-3666  
Attorneys for Plaintiff